



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,632	02/16/2005	Hideo Nawata	TEI-0131	1448
7590 Rader fishman & Grauer 1233 20th Street N W Suite 501 Washington, DC 20036				
			EXAMINER	
			MATTER, KRISTIN CLARETTE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/524,632

**Applicant(s)**

NAWATA, HIDEO

**Examiner**

KRISTEN C. MATTER

**Art Unit**

3771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/16/05, 4/19/05, 6/9/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 6/9/2008 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 4, line 12, reference is made the claims (i.e., "according to claim 1"). Please remove all references to the claims in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the oxygen-supplying passage" in line 3, "the aperture" and in line 9, "the set value" in line 10, "the respiration signal" in line 12, and "the flow rate set

value" in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. In addition, in line 6, reference is made to "a user" but a user has already been claimed, making it unclear as to whether this is the same user or a different user. Also in line 9, reference is made to "the closing valve" and in line 11, reference is made to "the automatic closing valve" making it confusing as to whether these are both referring to the automatic closing valve mentioned in line 3. Furthermore, in line 3, the language "the above" means is somewhat confusing because it is not clear what "the above means" is referring to (i.e., the oxygen generating means or the oxygen supplying means).

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the full close state" in line 2 and "the full open state in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Regarding claim 4, the phrase "adsorption-type" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "-type"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Does the oxygen generating means have to be a pressure variable adsorption oxygen concentrating means or not; and if not, how must it be similar to a pressure variable adsorption oxygen generating means?

Claim 3 is dependent on claims 1 or 2 and is therefore rejected for the reasons outlined above with respect to those claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yagi et al. (US 2002/0038656). Yagi et al. discloses an oxygen supplying apparatus comprising a pressure variable adsorption-type oxygen concentrating means provided with adsorption cylinders (19a, 19b) packed with adsorbent that adsorbs nitrogen rather than oxygen [0031] and a compressor (13) that supplies pressurized air to the cylinders. Yagi et al. further discloses oxygen supply means (33, 37) for supplying oxygen generated by the oxygen generating means to a user and an automatic closing valve (45) on the oxygen supplying passage, said passage provided with a respiration sensor (55) to detect the respiration of the user, a supply method setting means (Figure 4), a flow rate setting means (47), and a controlling means (59) to control an aperture of the closing valve in accordance with either a continuous flow or a respiration synchronism flow [103, 119, 121].

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagi et al. Yagi is silent as to the response time and diameter of the closing valve (45). However, the flow

rates to be delivered in the instant application and the prior art overlap and absent a critical teaching and/or a showing of unexpected results from having the closing valve have a response time of 0.1 seconds or less and a diameter of 1-5 mm, examiner contends it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the closing valve of Yagi et al. with a response time of less than 0.1 seconds and a diameter of 1-5 mm in order to allow the desired flow rates to be delivered to a patient efficiently and safely. Furthermore, a mere change in dimension does not patentably distinguish the invention over the prior art. Also, given that the closing valve of the instant application is commercially available (see page 10) and that the device of Yagi et al. has no structure that would prohibit the use of the claimed closing valve, it appears as though the device of Yagi et al. would perform equally well with a closing valve having a response time of less than 0.1 seconds and a diameter of 1-5 mm.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 10/569,463.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the copending claim and the instant claim are minor and obvious from each other. The instant claim 1 is a broader version of the copending claim 8 (i.e. the instant claim 1 does not include the structural element of the exhaust means or pressure measuring means as in the copending claim 8). In the instant claim 1, the structural elements are included in the copending claim 8. Any infringement over the copending application would also infringe over the instant claims. Hence, the instant claims 1-4 do not differ from the scope of the copending claims 1-17.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTEN C. MATTER whose telephone number is (571)272-5270. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kristen C. Matter/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3771

/Justine R Yu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3771